UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,989	08/15/2006	Mark Thomas Johnson	NL040147	8876
	7590 08/21/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		WOOLCOCK, LENWORTH A		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2629		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/21/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summany		Application No.		Applicant(s)					
		10/597,989	)	JOHNSON ET AL.					
Office Action Summary			Examiner		Art Unit				
			LENWORT	H WOOLCOCK	2629				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appe	ears on the	cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN INSIGN SOLVEN THE INSIGN OF	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. tatutory period wi y will, by statute,	ATE OF THI 66(a). In no ever ill apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION  It, however, may a reply be the expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cation to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this of the (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status									
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>15 Au</i>	iaust 2006						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 August 2006</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  2b) This action is non-final.								
3)		<i>7</i> —			osecution as to the	e merits is			
ت ا	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the	application.							
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,8,11 and 128</u> is/are rejected.								
·	Claim(s) <u>3-7, 9-10</u> is/are objected to								
•	Claim(s) are subject to restri		election re	guirement.					
				1					
	on Papers								
•	The specification is objected to by th								
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 August 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.									
	Applicant may not request that any object			-					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
2)  Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Ination Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date			4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

# Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 11 and 12 are drawn towards a computer program which is not patentable.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29

USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 8, and 11-12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 9-18 of copending Application No. 10/542982. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Claims 10-20 of Application 10/542982 recites a electrophoretic display consisting pixels assembled in groups; each group of pixels is driven by a different driving scheme in which the time period of the

shaking pulse is changed. Claim 10-20 differs from claim 1, 2 and 8 in that it fails to teach the time difference being at least 25% of the longest shaking time period for the respective groups. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the time difference being at least 25% of the longest shaking time period for the respective groups, since it has been held where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See in re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-7 and 9-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Consider claims 3 and 9, Application no. 10/542982 teaches the limitations of claim 1 and 8 of. However 10/542982 fails to teach or suggest the driving means are arranged to provide shaking potential differences such that the application schemes for application of the shaking potential differences alternate between groups between frames.

Art Unit: 2629

Consider claim 4-7 and 10, Application no. 10/542982 teaches the limitations of claim 1 and 8. However 10/542982 fails to teach or suggest a specified length of the shaking time period.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LENWORTH WOOLCOCK whose telephone number is (571)270-5152. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on 571-272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/597,989 Page 6

Art Unit: 2629

Examiner, Art Unit 2629 /Amare Mengistu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629